



1  
2  
3       **The following constitutes the order of the court.**  
4       **Signed October 2, 2015**  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12         
13       William J. Lafferty, III  
14       U.S. Bankruptcy Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

11                   **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
12                   **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
13                   **OAKLAND DIVISION**

14       In re    Case No. 12-46834  
15       Jorge Edgard Quinones,    )  
16       Lidia Delvalle Quinones,    )  
17       Debtors.    )  
18       The Board of Trustees, in    )  
19       their capacities as Trustees    )  
20       of the Cement Masons Pension    )  
21       Trust Fund for Northern    )  
22       California, et al.,    ) Adv. Pro. No. 13-04016  
23       Plaintiffs,    )  
24       v.    )  
25       Jorge Edgard Quinones,    )  
26       Lidia Delvalle Quinones,    )  
27       Defendants    )  
28

26                   **MEMORANDUM REGARDING RECENT NINTH CIRCUIT DECISION**  
27  
28

At a Status Conference held on Tuesday, September 29, the

1 Court set a hearing date of October 19, and a briefing schedule  
2 for Plaintiffs' *Motion to Dismiss Adversary Proceeding* (doc. 130)  
3 and Defendants' *Counter-Motion for Order Determining Prevailing*  
4 *Party* (doc. 141) and *Counter Motion for Sanctions* (doc. 142). In  
5 connection with the *Counter-Motion for Order Determining*  
6 *Prevailing Party*, the Court notes that on Thursday, October 1, the  
7 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals issued an opinion in the case  
8 *Penrod v. AmeriCredit Financial Services, Inc.*, 2015 WL 53730425,  
9 13-16097 (9th Cir. Oct. 1, 2015), that determined whether the  
10 debtor in that case, who had prevailed in a prior dispute with a  
11 secured lender, was entitled to attorneys fees under Section 1717  
12 of the California Civil Code, based on an argument that the prior  
13 dispute was an "action on the contract." While not presently  
14 deciding the precedential effect of the *Penrod* decision on the  
15 *Counter-Motion for Order Determining Prevailing Party*, the Court  
16 does believe that consideration of this decision would be  
17 appropriate in connection with the October 19 hearing, and expects  
18 the parties to address the effect of the decision in their further  
19 pleadings, and to be prepared to discuss the decision at the  
20 October 19 hearing.

21  
22 \*End of Memorandum\*  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## Court Service List

2 Jolene Kramer  
3 Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld  
1001 Marina Village Parkway #200  
4 Alameda, CA 94501

5 | Emily P. Rich  
Weinberg, Roger and Rosenfeld  
6 | 1001 Marina Village Parkway #200  
Alameda, CA 94501

8 David N. Chandler  
Law Offices of David N. Chandler  
1747 4th St.  
9 Santa Rosa, CA 95404